DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 486 EA 018 057

TITLE	Institutional Assessment of Prospective Educational Personnel in Undergraduate Programs. A Study to Assess the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Educational Personnel: Study Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	19p.; For related documents, see EA 018 056-058.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Graduation Requirements; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Recruitment; Student Teaching; Surveys; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; Illinois State Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This is the second of three technical reports that focus on the hiring and evaluation of educational personnel in Illinois. Practices used by colleges and universities to recruit, select, and assess prospective educational personnel at the undergraduate level are presented in this report. A questionnaire was sent to persons responsible for all state-approved educational preparation programs. Survey instruments had been partially completed by State Board of Education staff based on preexistent data files from the institutions, and respondents were asked to revise or provide information as necessary in order to supplement and update file information. Data presented reflect information from 148 completed survey instruments representing programs in elementary, secondary, special subject area (K-12), and special education programs at 53 colleges and universities. Findings are reported with respect to the five parts of the questionnaire: (1) admission to the institution; (2) admission to education programs; (3) admission to student teaching; (4) graduation and recommendation for certification; and (5) general perspective of the program. Tables which show both the questions asked and the distribution of responses are provided in an appendix. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Leandro A. Bartolini

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED262486

A Study to Assess the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Educational Personnel

Study Report #2

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF PROSPECTIVE EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Edward Copeland, Chairperson
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

Springfield, Illinois

Fall, 1982

EA 018 057

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 1

PROCEDURES 3

FINDINGS 4

- Admission to the Institution 4
- Admission to Education Programs 5
- Admission to Student Teaching 6
- Graduation and Recommendation for Certification 7
- General Perspective of Program 8

SUMMARY 9

APPENDIX A: TABLES 10

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the findings of a survey conducted in the spring of 1982. It is one of three technical reports which focus on the recruitment, selection, retention, and assessment practices employed in Illinois during the preparation, hiring, and evaluation of educational personnel. Statewide information will be used to identify issues regarding the quality of the preparation and performance of educational personnel. Practices used by colleges and universities to recruit, select, and assess prospective educational personnel at the undergraduate level are presented in this report.

BACKGROUND

Ten years ago, when there was little disagreement over the fact that supply of teachers was greater than demand for teachers, in almost all subject areas and in most geographic regions, it was not uncommon to hear the view that this situation provided a golden opportunity to improve education. Schools of education could raise standards and be more selective about the teacher candidates admitted to professional preparation programs. Likewise, local district administrators could choose the "most qualified" candidate from a relatively large pool of candidates. What was particularly interesting about these proposals to improve education was that they were made at a time when, relatively speaking, there was little dissatisfaction with the overall quality of education.

Perceptions regarding the quality of education, as well as the supply/demand balance of educational personnel have changed. Illinois in particular has experienced a steady decrease in both the demand for teachers and the supply of newly prepared personnel. For the most part, however, supply has decreased faster than demand. The current supply/demand balance is viewed by many local district administrators to be insufficient for them to find "qualified" candidates. On the other hand, Deans of Education are concerned that decreased enrollment in some teacher education programs may not be sufficient to justify continuation of the programs. Opportunities to improve education by raising standards and selecting applicants, for many, are perceived to no longer exist. Rather, the problem is perceived by some to be one of recruiting prospective teachers, both at the college level and the local district level, in order to meet program needs.

Changing supply and demand is not the only reason, and perhaps not a primary reason, there is now much greater concern about the quality of education in our schools. Declining student aptitude and achievement scores, stories about children graduating who are not able to read, general concern in times of restricted budgets that one is not getting "his or her dollar's worth," have all contributed to increased attention, by both the public in general and among educational professionals, to the quality of education.

Given this gradual change in the perceptions regarding the quality of education, the Illinois State Board of Education has consistently and persistently taken action designed to improve the preparation of educational personnel. Since 1975, the State Board of Education has: (1) adopted a set of standards and criteria to be used in the review of teacher education

institutions and their programs; (2) supported legislation which became effective July 1, 1981, requiring all applicants for certificates to complete approved programs; (3) periodically reviewed the supply of professional educators, urged institutions to improve the quality of preparatory programs, and monitored the quality of these programs through a continuing review system; (4) adopted a policy to work closely with the Illinois Board of Higher Education in the approval of new preparation programs; and (5) adopted requirements for increased field experiences as a part of all professional preparation programs.

Legislators and represenatives of professional education associations have also expressed general concern about the quality of education in Illinois. Following the examples of other states, proposals have been introduced and/or debated which would require minumum competency tests for graduation from high school. Other proposals would require proficiency exams for prospective teachers. Among the pool of proposals and counterproposals, questions regarding the recruitment and selection practices of colleges of education in Illinois continue to be raised. In addition, local district selection and retention practices have been identified as needing review.

There is general agreement among those concerned with the quality of education in Illinois that recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation practices, at both the college or university level and the local district level, will affect the quality of educational personnel. There is less agreement on exactly how these factors affect quality. It is also generally assumed that Illinois institutions of higher education and local districts have developed diverse and varied practices in recruiting, selecting, and assessing educational personnel. Yet, there is little available information from a comprehensive, statewide perspective on what, in fact, constitutes common practices.

Given the current level of concern about the quality of education in Illinois as well as the scarcity of information about current recruitment, selection, and retention practices, the Illinois State Board of Education adopted a proposal in July of 1981 directing its staff to conduct a series of studies which would address some of these relevant issues. That proposal, in part, read as follows:

> The State Board of Education in one of its goal statements has committed itself to periodic review of "teacher education/certification standards compatible with educational needs." Such a review is timely in light of present concerns regarding the preparation and performance of certificated personnel. There are four major issues for which further examination and study should provide the Board information and data upon which to consider additional policy on teacher education, certification and assessment of educational professionals. They are:
>
> 1) What are Illinois institutions currently doing to assess the quality of teacher, school service personnel, and administrator graduates? What are the recruitment, selection, retention and evaluation criteria used by institutions?

2) What criteria are local school districts using in selecting staff? Do the selection criteria indicate needs for staff not addressed in preparation programs?

3) What are the constraints on institutions and school districts which may affect recruitment into the field of education, selection of staff, and improvement of staff skills?

4) What are the experiences of other states in using assessment instruments and what potential does assessment prior to certification have for Illinois?

Three separate surveys were conducted in the spring of 1982 in an effort to answer, in part, the questions raised in the proposal. First, a survey of local district practices was conducted. The purpose of this survey was to obtain information about the recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation of prospective teachers in Illinois public schools. Second, survey questionnaires were sent to persons responsible for the preparation of professional educational personnel at colleges and universities, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The purpose of these surveys was to verify and obtain information about the recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation of prospective teachers in Illinois public and nonpublic colleges and universities. Since it was recognized that recruitment and selection practices would differ for undergraduates and graduates, two separate questionnaires were developed, one for each level.

PROCEDURES

Information obtained from Illinois State Board of Education files suggests that selection, retention, and evaluation practices employed in Illinois colleges and universities vary from institution to institution and from program to program. Using available information, a draft questionnaire was developed which was then shared with persons involved in the process of preparing educational personnel for their review and comment. Once revised, the questionnaire was sent to persons responsible for all state approved educational preparation programs to be surveyed. Before mailing, survey instruments had been partially completed by State Board of Education staff using data previously obtained from the institutions and on file. Respondents were asked to revise or provide information as necessary in order to supplement and update file information.

Four types of undergraduate programs were identified and included in the study: elementary (K-9), secondary (6-12), special subject area (K-12), and special education. Approximately 91 percent of the surveys were completed and returned. Based upon this high rate of return, findings reported are considered to be a relatively accurate representation of practices statewide. Data presented reflect information obtained and analyzed from 148 completed survey instruments representing programs at fifty-three colleges and universities.

FINDINGS

The survey instrument sent to colleges and universities with undergraduate level educational preparation programs was divided into five parts: 1) Admission to the Institution, 2) Admission to Education Programs, 3) Admission to Student Teaching, 4) Graduation and Recommendation for Certification, and 5) General Perspective of Program. Tables which show both the questions asked and the distribution of responses are provided in the Appendix of this report. The survey questions and results are presented in exactly the same order they were presented on the study questionnaire.

Admission to the Institution

Colleges and universities utilize a number of different factors to determine if an applicant, including a prospective teacher, will be admitted as an undergraduate. To identify those commonly used and to ascertain their relative importance, respondents were asked to check and rank those factors pertaining to admission procedures at their respective institutions. (See Table II-1.)

Five items were utilized in the admission process for over half of all programs: (1) Schalastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores or American College Test (ACT) scores, (2) Rank in high school class, (3) Interviews, (4) Approvals or recommendations, and (5) Required units in high school coursework. Use of SAT/ACT scores was checked by 94.6 percent of the respondents, and when used, this item was ranked relatively high. It was clear from the responses that SAT/ACT scores were used in combination with other criteria. Respondents frequently indicated that the "cut-off" score or required score was flexible, depending upon the strength of other criteria. SAT scores required for admission ranged from a combined mathematics/verbal score of 1200 to a combined score of 800. The mean SAT score was 901.7. ACT scores ranged from a high composite score of 23 to a low of 12. The mean composite ACT scoe was 18.7.

Rank in the high school graduating class was checked as an admission criterion by 76.4 percent of the respondents. High school ranks required for admission ranged from the top 20 percent to the top 50 percent. The mean or average high school rank required for students for admission was that they be in the top 55 percent of their class. Interviews, usually conducted by admissions office staff, were utilized by 57.4 percent of the respondents. Recommendations and specific coursework in high school were each utilized by 53.4 percent. Twenty-three to 39 percent of the respondents indicated that units were required in English, science, foreign languages, mathematics, or social studies.

All other items utilized in the admission process were checked by fewer then half of the respondents. Other factors, and the percentage of survey respondents using them, were as follows: high school grades (44.6 percent), proficiency in reading and writing (39.9) percent), portfolio or audition (30.4 percent), proficiency in math (27.7 percent).

Transfer students are treated differently from students applying to college for the first time when deciding whether to admit them. (See Table II-2.) Up to 35 percent of the respondents indicated that one or more of the

criteria used to admit first time students are also used to admit transfer students, but 85.8 percent indicated that grade point average at other institutions was used in lieu of or in addition to other criteria. Usually, a grade point average of 2.0 or above, on a 4.0 scale, is required. Letters of recommendations from other institutions are also used to admit transfer students by 31.1 percent of the respondents. Over 33 percent of the respondents indicated that transfer students with an AA or AS degree are admitted without regard to other criteria.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents indicated that Comprehensive Learning Experience Performance (CLEP) exams were accepted, and 83 percent indicated that the GED was accepted in lieu of a high school diploma. Over half of those accepting the GED, however, indicated that other criteria must also be met.

Respondents were asked to indicate if their respective institutions had provisions for admitting students with specified characteristics (economic status, racial or cultural background, talent or previous performance in specific areas) who did not meet criteria noted previously. Few respondents answered this question. Respondents at four institutions indicated that special programs, including a work/study program, existed for students from specific economic backgrounds. Special admission by committee or admission by special recommendation were also utilized for these students.

Respondents from eight institutions indicated that special provisions existed for admitting students from specific racial or cultural backgrounds. Provisions included special programs for screening candidates for basic skills, special programs which required that students take specific courses, other special admissions programs, and special scholarships.

Special development/skills programs also existed for students with specific talent or academic backgrounds. Five respondents indicated that, in addition to these special programs, special admissions by committee and special scholarships existed for these students.

Admission to Education Programs

Standards for admission to an undergraduate college are not the same as standards for admission to teacher education programs. To determine what additional criteria must be met to enroll in an education program, survey respondents were asked to identify the additional factors considered for admission to their respective programs. (See Table II-3.)

Approvals or recommendations, usually by faculty in a student's major or by professional education faculty, and an overall grade point average (GPA) were the most frequently identified requirements. Approximately 84.5 percent of the respondents identified recommendations or approvals as a requirement. About the same percentage, 85.8 percent, identified an overall grade point average as a requirement. Required GPA's were usually 2.0 or above on a 4.0 scale.

A GPA in one's major, usually a 2.0 or 2.5 on a 4.0 scale, was an additional criterion identified by over half the respondents (60.8 percent) as a necessary requirement to enroll in the teacher education program. Other criteria used for admitting students to education programs and the percentage of respondents identifying each item were as follows: Good

character, emotional stability, social standards (51.4 percent), other types of assessment of performance (49.3 percent), GPA in Professional Education (45.9 percent), more than 30 hours of college work (45.9 percent), GPA in General Education (35.1 percent). Of the twenty-one respondents who provided comments on how good character, emotional stability, or social standards were assessed, most listed recommendations. Four listed performance in courses, and two indicated that interviews were used.

The item, "other types of assessment of performance," included examples of "other types of performance." Over forty percent of the respondents (40.5 percent) indicated that writing (expository or discursive) was assessed. Of those, most required candidates to take an institutional test or to complete a specific course. Twenty-two percent of the respondents indicated that they test candidates for proficiency in reading, either by an institution's test or by use of a nationally standardized test. Fifteen percent indicated that they test candidates for proficiency in mathematics.

Almost 12 percent of the respondents indicated that there were no requirements beyond those necessary for admission to the institution in order for candidates to enroll in education programs.

Admission to Student Teaching

It is sometimes suggested by persons involved in the professional preparation of teachers that weak or uncommitted candidates might be identified and discouraged before they enter student-teaching. Once candidates enter student-teaching, it is argued, the commitment of time and other resources make it difficult for students to change their minds or pursue alternative careers. To determine what, if any, criteria might be required of candidates before they enter student teaching, survey respondents were asked to check those factors, from a list of eight, which were either reviewed again or which were added to previous requirements in order for students to enroll. (See Table II-4.)

Seven factors were checked by more than half of the respondents. Those factors, and the percentage of respondents checking each factor, were as follows: (1) overall grade point average (91.9 percent), (2) assessment of performance in clinical experiences (81.1 percent), (3) approvals or recommendations (77.0 percent), (4) Grade point average in major (66.9 percent), (5) more than 90 credit hours of college work (65.5 percent), (6) GPA in professional education (52.0 percent), and (7) Assessment of character (52.0 percent). Of those listing assessment of character, twenty-six respondents indicated that recommendations or reports by committees, faculty, supervisors, or cooperating teachers were utilized to make this assessment. Four indicated that performance in clinical experiences was used, and two indicated that interviews were used.

Only one was checked by less than half of the respondents, grade point average in general education (28.4 percent).

The percentage and distribution of responses to items listed as factors to be considered before candidates enter student teaching, suggest that students enrolled in education programs are not automatically allowed to participate in student teaching. Many of the same criteria used to determine admission to education programs are reviewed again prior to

admission to student teaching. In addition, more credit hours of college work must generally be completed, and performance in clinical experiences is frequently assessed.

Graduation and Recommendation for Certification

Graduation from an institution and recommendation for certification are contingent upon certain requirements being met by candidates. To determine the types and extent of criteria required of prospective teachers, survey respondents were asked to identify those which applied to their respective programs. (See Table II-5.) Three criteria were checked by a majority of the respondents: overall grade point average, usually a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, approvals or recommendations by faculty or department chairpersons, and grade point average in the student's major, most frequently a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. Overall GPA was checked by 95.9 percent of the respondents, recommendations or approval by 77.0 percent, and GPA in one's major by 73.0 percent.

Only 48.0 percent of the respondents indicated that maintenance of a student teaching grade was required for certification or graduation; 44.6 percent indicated that a GPA in professional education was required, and only 26.4 percent indicated that a GPA in general education was required.

Almost half, 44.6 percent, of the respondents indicated that good character, emotional stability, or social standards were criteria used to determine eligibility for graduation or certification. Almost 51 percent indicated that other types of assessment of performance were used. A very small percentage, 7.4 percent, required a major department examination, and only 2.7 percent indicated that the National Teacher Examination (NTE) was utilized. Of those indicating that assessment of good character was utilized as a criterion for graduation or recommendation for certification, most listed recommendations as the method used to make this assessment. Some indicated that performance in student-teaching was used to assess good character.

If "other" types of assessment of performance were utilized to determine eligibility for graduation or certification, respondents were asked to identify the areas in which assessment occurred. Just under half indicated that writing was assessed, usually by having a student complete a course. Almost 18 percent indicated they tested for proficiency in reading, and 20.9 percent tested for proficiency in mathematics.

As a follow-up question to the list of graduation or certification requirements which might be identified, respondents were asked to indicate if educational performance was assessed in any manner which was not reflected in one's GPA. Almost 30 percent of the respondents answered positively. Fourteen respondents provided comments on how educational performance was assessed. Half (7) indicated that performance in early field experiences and student-teaching performance were utilized. A few indicated that better evaluation's were used. Two listed special mathematics or English examinations.

As was the case when reviewing criteria utilized for admission to education programs and student teaching, overall grade point average, grade point average in one's major, and approval or recommendations appear to be the major factors used to determine eligibility for graduation or certification.

General Perspective of Program

The purpose of the last part of the survey was to obtain general information about the quality of personnel in undergraduate teacher education programs. (See Table II-6.) When asked if the academic potential of education candidates for their respective programs had increased or decreased over the past ten years, 41.2 percent of the respondents indicated that it had increased. Approximately 12 percent indicated that they believed academic potential had decreased. The rest, approximately 42 percent, did not respond, suggesting that the academic potential of candidates was about the same as ten years ago.

Twenty-seven respondents provided comments on why the potential of candidates has changed. Eleven indicated that closer or better screening processes were now employed. Nine indicated that candidates are better prepared then they were 10 years ago, and that they are more serious. Eight suggested that higher admission standards as well as higher standards in their respective programs accounted for the higher quality of student. Only three respondents provided reasons why potential may have decreased. Those reasons included the following: less of a commitment to excell on the part of students, weaker basic skills, and the belief that smarter students are staying out of education.

Respondents were also asked to estimate the percentage of education candidates that did not meet academic criteria in initial application for admission to teacher education, for admission to student teaching, in application for graduation, and in application for entitlement. For all undergraduate programs, it was estimated that an average of 12.2 percent of the candidates did not meet academic criteria when applying for admission to teacher education. An average of 5.4 percent did not meet academic criteria when applying for admission to student teaching. When applying for graduation, it was estimated that 3.2 percent did not meet academic criteria, and when applying for recommendation for certification, it was estimated that 7.1 percent did not meet academic criteria.

A further question asked respondents to indicate the percentage of those enrolled in student teaching in the academic year 1980-81 who received grades of A, B, C, D, or F. If letter grades were not used, respondents were asked to estimate the percentage who received a satisfactory or unsatisfactory grade. It was reported, on the average, that 75.9 percent of the students received a grade of A in student teaching. About 19.5 percent received a grade of B. Only 5.1 percent received a C, 1 percent received a D, and 1 percent received an F. For those not using letter grades, 91.2 percent received a satisfactory grade, 3.2 percent received an unsatisfactory grade.

The survey instrument ended with two open-ended questions. Respondents were first asked if they made any effort to recruit people into teacher education and if they did, what were the restraints, if any. Respondents were also asked to list any steps taken in the last ten years designed to ensure improved academic performance of education candidates.

Thirty-five respondents provided comments on recruitment efforts. Almost half indicated that they recruit by using various methods to advertise their programs. This list included the distribution of brochures or pamphlets,

the holding of career nights, and informal meetings or contacts. Three indicated that they promoted closer working relations with the admission staff. Of those listing restraints, the most frequent response was that the lack of opportunities for placement or jobs restricted recruitment efforts.

Thirty-eight respondents provided comments on steps taken to improve academic performance of candidates. Of those, twenty-four indicated that higher standards or more standards are now employed. Thirteen indicated that better screening practices are employed. Ten suggested that better advising/counseling systems now exist, and ten listed continuing program review, curriculum revision, and the establishment of review committees as steps taken to improve performance. Other steps listed by three to ten respondents included the increase in required practicum or clinical experiences, better training techniques, and better evaluation and supervision.

SUMMARY

A major purpose of this study was to obtain information about the criteria and standards used in the recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation of prospective teachers in undergraduate education programs. Criteria and standards used to admit prospective teachers to colleges or universities may not differ from criteria and standards used for all other students. Nevertheless, the use of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores or American College Test (ACT) scores, the use of rank in high school class, a reflection of grades, and the use of interviews predominate as factors considered for initial admission to colleges and universities.

Different criteria are used for transfer students when considering initial admission to a college or university. Overall grade point average in another institution is the major criterion used.

While a number of factors might be considered when reviewing applicants or candidates for admission to education programs, admission to student teaching, and for graduation and recommendation for certification, three criteria predominate at all levels once students are admitted to the college or university. Those factors are overall grade point average, approval or recommendation, and to a somewhat lesser extent, grade point average in a major.

Differences in criteria utilized are most obvious when candidates apply for admission to student teaching. At this stage, assessment of performance in clinical experiences and completion of over 90 credit hours of work become important requirements.

The percentage and distribution of responses which identify criteria and requirements to be satisfied at the various stages of the undergraduate education programs, suggest that prospective teachers are not automatically passed through and/or out of the preparation programs once they are admitted to the college or university. Rather, criteria and requirements must be satisfied at three additional levels.

The degree to which the criteria and requirements represent rigorous or high standards and the degree to which the criteria and requirements are vigorously imposed, will ultimately affect the quality of the educational personnel prepared.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF PROSPECTIVE EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL:
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Table II-1

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES									
I. Admission to the Institution										
A. Achievement Criteria: The items checked in Column A are factors used to determine whether an applicant, including a prospective teacher will be admitted as an undergraduate. Revise the items checked in Column A if inaccurate. Then rank the factors used to determine admission according to importance in Column B (1 = most important).	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%) 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. SAT/ACT Scores	94.6	2.0	47.8	17.8	26.7	0.0	6.7	1.1	0.0	0.0
Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Mean 901.7 High 1200 Low 800										
American College Test (ACT): Mean 18.7 High 23 Low 12										
2. Rank in high school class.	76.4	2.2	34.2	37.0	8.2	19.2	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean: Top 53% High Top 20% Low Top 50%										
3. High School Grades: Required overall average for:	44.6	2.0	48.9	31.1	8.9	0.0	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
English	31.1									
Math	31.1									
Science	31.1									
4. High School Coursework: Required units in:	53.4	3.0	14.9	36.2	17.0	17.0	4.3	4.3	6.4	0.0
English	39.2									
Science	29.7									
Foreign Language	23.0									
Mathematics	31.8									
Social Studies	29.1									
5. Proficiency in Reading and Writing. Check if the following are used:	39.9	4.5	3.7	14.8	7.4	40.7	0.0	11.1	14.8	7.4
Institutional Test	21.6									
Review of Writing Samples	18.9									
Nationally Standardized Test	19.6									
6. Proficiency in Math. Check if the following are used:	27.7	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	36.4	36.4	0.0	0.0
Institutional Test	9.5									
Nationally Standardized Test	15.5									
7. Interviews: Conducted by:	57.4	3.5	15.3	15.3	16.9	20.3	25.3	3.4	3.4	0.0
Faculty	16.2									
Alumni/ae	3.4									
Admissions Office Staff	44.6									
8. Approvals or Recommendations	53.4	4.1	12.1	1.7	24.1	12.1	31.0	15.5	0.0	3.4
Secondary School Administrators	29.1									
Secondary Teachers	38.5									
Other	27.0									
9. Portifolio or Audition	30.4	4.4	7.1	0.0	21.4	35.7	0.0	21.4	14.3	0.0
Reviewed by:										
Faculty Member	12.8									
Admissions Officer	5.4									
Faculty Committee	11.5									
Outside Examiner	0.0									

Table II-2

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES

B. Transfer Students

1. Circle the numbers of the above criteria and processes used in determining admission of transfer students.

	Percentage Checking Response
1. SAT/ACT Scores	35.1
2. Ranking High School	29.1
3. High School Grades	10.8
4. High School Coursework	17.6
5. Proficiency in Reading and Writing	14.2
6. Proficiency in Math	6.8
7. Interviews	29.7
8. Approvals or Recommendations	27.7
9. Portifolio or Audition	15.5

2. Are any of the following criteria or procedures used for transfer students in lieu of or in addition to the above? Please check those used.

	Number and Percentage Responding	
a. Grade point average at other institution(s). Required average: (4=A)	Number	%
	127	85.8
4.0	3	2.0
3.5	3	2.0
3.0	15	10.1
2.5	11	7.4
2.0	110	74.3
1.5	0	0.0
Other	6	4.1
b. Letters of recommendation from other institution(s). Submitted by:	46	31.1
Dean	25	16.9
Advisor	20	13.5
Faculty	20	13.5
3. Are AA degree or AS degree students admitted without regard to other criteria?		
Yes	49	33.1
No	79	53.4
4. Do you accept Comprehensive Learning Experience Performance (CLEP) exams?		
Yes	121	81.8
No	12	8.1
5. Do you accept the GED in lieu of a high school diploma?		
Yes	53	35.8
Yes, but only if other criteria are met	70	47.3
No	6	4.1

Table II-3

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
II. Admission to Education Programs		
Check the following criteria candidates must meet in order to enroll in your education program.		
1. No other requirements other than those necessary for admission to institution	17	11.5
2. More than 30 credit hours of college work.	68	45.9
3. Overall Grade Point Average (GPA) of: (4.0 scale)	127	85.8
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	84	56.8
2.5	47	31.8
3.0	0	0.0
Above	1	0.7
4. GPA in General Education (4.0 scale)	52	35.1
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	23	15.5
2.5	24	16.2
3.0	1	0.7
Above 3.0	0	0.0
5. GPA in Major (4.0 scale)	90	60.8
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	37	25.0
2.5	40	27.0
3.0	8	5.4
Above 3.0	1	0.7
6. GPA in Professional Education: (4.0 Scale)	68	45.9
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	36	24.3
2.5	26	17.6
3.0	4	2.7
Above 3.0	0	0.0
7. Good character, emotional stability, social standards.	76	51.4
8. Other types of assessment of performance	73	49.3
a. Writing (expository or discursive writing)	60	40.5
Nationally Standardized Test	3	2.0
Institutional Test	48	32.4
Completion of Course	53	35.8
b. Test for Proficiency in Reading	33	22.3
Institutional Test	14	9.5
Nationally Standardized Test	16	10.8
c. Test for Proficiency in mathematics	22	14.9
Institutional Test	13	8.9
Nationally Standardized Test	6	4.1
9. Approvals or Recommendations:	125	84.5
Major Faculty	65	43.9
Major Department Chairman	59	39.9
Professional Education Faculty	74	50.0
Advisor	46	31.1

Table II-4

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES- Number and Percentage Responding Number	%
III. Admission to Student Teaching		
Check the following criteria candidates must meet to enroll in student teaching.		
1. More than 90 credit hours of college work.	97	65.5
2. Overall Grade Point Average	136	91.9
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	70	47.3
2.5	63	42.6
3.0	2	1.4
Above 3.0	0	0.0
3. GPA in General Education (4.0 scale)	42	28.4
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	19	12.9
2.5	23	15.5
3.0	1	0.7
Above 3.0	0	0.0
4. GPA in major: (4.0 scale)	99	66.9
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	41	27.7
2.5	44	29.7
3.0	10	6.8
Above 3.0	2	1.4
5. GPA in Professional Education: (4.0 scale)	77	52.0
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	37	25.0
2.5	32	21.0
3.0	11	7.4
Above 3.0	0	0.0
6. Assessment of performance in clinical experiences	120	81.1
7. Assessments of charcter, emotional stability, social standards	77	52.0
8. Approvals or Recommendations:	114	77.0
Major Faculty	51	34.5
Major Department Chairman	70	47.3
Professional Education Faculty	65	43.9
Advisory	37	25.0

Table II-5

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
IV. GRADUATION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR CERTIFICATION		
Check the following criteria candidates must meet in order to graduate from the institution and be recommended for certification	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
1. Student Teaching Grade of:	71	48.0
1.5	2	1.4
2.0	41	27.7
2.5	6	4.1
3.0	8	5.5
Above 3.0	1	0.7
2. Overall GPA: (4.0 scale)	142	95.9
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	97	65.5
2.5	39	26.4
3.0	2	1.4
Above 3.0	0	0.0
3. GPA in General Education (4.0 scale)	39	26.4
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	21	14.2
2.5	15	10.1
3.0	1	0.7
Above 3.0	0	0.0
4. GPA in the Major: (4.0 scale)	108	73.0
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	63	42.6
2.5	37	25.0
3.0	8	5.4
Above 3.0	0	0.0
5. GPA in Professional Education: (4.0 Scale)	66	44.6
1.5	0	0.0
2.0	32	21.6
2.5	26	17.6
3.0	8	5.4
Above 3.0	0	0.0
6. Good character, emotional stability, social standards	66	44.6
7. Approvals or Recommendations:	114	77.0
Major Faculty	47	31.8
Major Department Chairman	58	39.2
Professional Education Faculty	50	33.8
Dean of College	42	28.4
8. Other types of Assessment of Performance	75	50.7
Check the following criteria and procedures used to determine the performance of candidates at any point prior to graduation or recommendation for certification.		
a. Writing (expository or discursive writing)	67	45.3
Nationally Standardized Test:	12	8.1
Institution Test	35	23.6
Completion of Course	53	35.8
b. Test for Proficiency in Reading	26	17.6
Institutional Test	16	10.8
Nationally Standardized Test	10	6.8
c. Test for Proficiency in Mathematics	31	20.9
Institutional Test	21	14.2
Nationally Standardized Test	8	5.4
9. Major Department Examination	11	7.4
10. National Teacher Examination	4	2.7
11. Is the educational performance assessed in any manner which is not reflected in one's GPA?		
Yes	44	29.7
No	25	16.9

Table II-6

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
V. GENERAL PERSPECTIVE OF PROGRAM		
A. In your view, has the academic potential of education candidates for this program over the past 10 years?		
Increased	61	41.2
Decreased	18	12.2
B. Estimate the percentage of education candidates of your institution that do not meet academic criteria in initial application at the following points in their pursuit of a program.		
	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
%1. Admission to teacher education Mean 12.2% High 50% Low 1%	95	64.2
%2. Admission to student teaching Mean 5.4% High 25% Low 1%	79	53.4
%3. Application for graduation Mean 3.2% High 10% Low 1%	45	30.4
%4. Application for entitlement Mean 7.1% High 50% Low 1%	28	18.9
C. What percentage of those enrolled in student teaching in academic year 1980-81 recieved the following grades in student teaching?		
A. - Mean 75.9% High 100% Low 6%	72	48.6
B. - Mean 19.5% igh 100% Low 2%	69	46.4
C. - Mean 5.1% High 25% Low 1%	45	30.4
D. - Mean 1.0% High 1% Low 1%	5	3.4
F. - Mean 1.0% High 1% Low 1%	7	4.7
Satisfactory Mean 91.2 High 100% Low 11%	52	35.1
UnSatisfactory Mean 3.2% High 11% Low 1%	21	14.2

JAS/1515h

BEST COPY AVAILABLE